

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO	. F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,967		06/29/2001	Evren Eryurek	30203/37386	9898
4743	7590	08/09/2004		EXAMINER	
	•	STEIN & BOR	POPE, DARYL C		
	6300 SEARS TOWER 233 S. WACKER DRIVE CHICAGO, IL 60606			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO				2632	\
				DATE MAILED: 08/09/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>							
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/896,967	ERYUREK ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		DARYL C POPE	2632				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHO THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failui Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Issions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing of patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	66(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Ju	ne 2004.					
-		action is non-final.					
<i>,</i> —	,—						
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) <u>18-20</u> is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Application	on Papers						
9) 🔲 -	The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•					
	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) 🔲 -	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachmant	(a)						
Attachment(1) ☐ Notice	(s) of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Intonia O	(PTO 412)				
2) 🔲 Notice	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te				
3) 🔲 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal Page 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2632

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

ART REJECTION:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wilson et al(Wilson) for the reasons of record as discussed in the previous office action.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The primary reasons of indicating allowability of claims 18-20 is the inclusion of associating the device status condition in a first plurality of possible device status condition with one device status condition in a second plurality of possible device status conditions, which is not taught by the prior art.

REMARKS:

Response to Arguments

- 4. Applicant's arguments filed 6/10/04 have been fully considered but they are not deemed persuasive for the following reasons.
- 5. <u>APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS:</u>
- 1) "Claim 1 recites a method of generating a HART alert message within a process control system.......Wilson does not teach, disclose or suggest any of the elements of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Wilson."

Art Unit: 2632

2) "Claim 2 depends from claim 1.......At least for this additional reason, claim 2 is allowable over Wilson."

- 3) "Claim 14 recites, inter alia, associating the detected condition with one of a device failure.......Therefore, Wilson does not teach, disclose, or suggest the above-identified elements of claim 14. At least for this reason, claim 14 is allowable over Wilson."
- 4) "It is respectfully asserted that independent claim 8 and new independent claim 18 are allowable at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.........Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 19 and 20 are allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 18."

6. EXAMINER'S RESPONSE:

1) Applicant is asserting that the system of Wilson does not read on the claimed subject matter with respect to claim 1 because Wilson describes a control system for fire and security alarm systems of a building, and does not teach anything about HART devices, their conditions, or their alert messages. The examiner disagrees with the applicant's assertion considering that the applicant defined the HART device as a Highway Addressable Remote Transducer device. Therefore most of the devices which are monitored by the system of Wilson fall under the definition of HART devices, since the system of Wilson communicates with its devices utilizing an addressable electronic communication system which would have constituted a highway, and as well since the devices of Wilson are remote transducers.

Therefore, the examiner deems that the definition of HART devices does not distinguish the system of the present invention from the system of Wilson in a manner

Art Unit: 2632

that would have made the present invention allowable. In view of this, applicant argument is not deemed persuasive.

2-4) With regards to applicant's argument 2-3, the examiner disagrees with applicant since the entire premise of the system of Wilson is the monitoring, detecting, advising, displaying and correcting of faults of the monitored devices in the system, as shown by the operation of the software of the Master Control Program of the PC(12). In view of this, applicant's argument is not deemed persuasive.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DARYL C POPE whose telephone number is (703) 305-4838. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 7:30-6:00.

Art Unit: 2632

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, DANIEL WU can be reached on (703) 308-6730. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daryl C. Pope

Aug. 8, 2004

DARYL C POPE

Primary Examiner Art Unit 2632